

REMARKS

Claims 27 – 32, 34, 35, 37 – 42 and 47 – 49 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 – 26, 33, 36 and 43 – 46 are canceled.

In section 1 of the Office Action, the Office is objecting to the drawings because reference character "3" has been used to designate both of a collector mirror and a collector lens.

Applicants are amending FIGS. 3, 5a, 5b and 10 to designate the collector mirror with reference number 3A. Applicants are amending the specification for consistency with the drawings.

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Office is objecting to claim 49 as being an improper dependent claim. Applicants are rewriting claim 49 as an independent claim. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 49 is respectfully solicited.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 27, 28 and 31 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,195,201 to Koch et al. (hereinafter "the Koch et al. patent"). Claims 33, 36 and 43 – 46 are canceled, thus obviating the rejection of claims 33, 36 and 43 – 46. Claims 27, 37, 47 and 49 are independent claims. Applicants clarified an aspect of claims 27, 37, 47 and 49 that is not disclosed by the Koch et al. patent.

Claim 27 provides for an illumination system. The illumination system includes (a) a plate having a plurality of raster elements situated thereon, and (b) a movable carrier upon which said plate is arranged, for positioning said plate relative to a light beam.

The Koch et al. patent, with reference to FIG. 3A, discloses a reflective fly's eye or mirror array 16 having a plurality of reflective facets (col. 5, lines 9 – 16). A positioning or axial displacement of the reflective fly's eyes may be accomplished by pistons contacting the facets (col. 5, lines 34 – 38). If the curvature of all of the facets of the first reflective fly's eye or mirror array are chosen to be identical, the axial position, or piston, of each facet must be selected to ensure an adequate focus of the source at the selected facet of the second reflective fly's eye or

mirror array (col. 9, lines 49 – 53). Thus, the Koch et al. patent discloses an arrangement of moveable facets, wherein each facet has a piston associated therewith.

Although the Koch et al. patent discloses moveable facets, wherein each facet has a piston associated therewith, the Koch et al. patent does not disclose that the facets are situated on a plate, that is, in turn, situated on a movable carrier. Consequently, the Koch et al. patent does not disclose (a) **a plate** having a plurality of raster elements situated thereon, and (b) **a movable carrier** upon which said plate is arranged, **for positioning said plate** relative to a light beam, as recited in claim 27. Thus, the Koch et al. patent does not anticipate claim 27.

Claims 37, 47 and 49 each includes a recital similar to that of claim 27, as described above. As such, claims 37, 47 and 49, for reasoning similar to that provided for claim 27, are novel over the Koch et al. patent.

Claims 28, 31, 32, 34 and 35 depend from claim 27. Claims 38 – 42 depend from claim 37. Claim 48 depends from claim 47. At least because of these dependencies, claims 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38 – 42 and 48 are all also novel over the Koch et al. patent.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(e) rejection of claims 27, 28 and 31 – 49.

In section 6 of the Office Action, claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Koch et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,015,976 to Hatakeyama et al. Claims 29 and 30 depend from claim 27. Applicants submit that the Hatakeyama et al. patent does not make up for the deficiency of the Koch et al. patent, as the Koch et al. patent applies to claim 27. As such, Applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over the cited combination of the Koch et al. and Hatakeyama et al. patents. Claims 29 and 30, at least because of their dependence on claim 27, are also patentable over the cited combination of the Koch et al. and Hatakeyama et al. patents.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 29 and 30.

As mentioned above, Applicants are amending claim 49 to address an objection, and clarifying an aspect of claims 27, 37, 47 and 49 that is not disclosed by the art of record. Additionally, Applicants are amending claims 31, 32, 34 and 38 for consistency with claims from which they depend. None of the amendments is intended to narrow the meaning of any term of the claims, and as such, the doctrine of equivalents should be available for all of the elements of all of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

March 13, 2006
Date

ell 2.7.2
Edward L. McMahon
Reg. No. 44,927
Attorney for the Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: 203-327-4500
Fax: 203-327-6401

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace drawing sheets 2, 3 and 8 with the version included herewith.